

Establishing Procedures to Evaluate the Use of Accommodation on the Maine Educational Assessment

Prepared for

**Valerie Seaberg
Chief of Staff**

Maine Department of Education

July 10, 2006

Table 7. Linear Regression: Reading Scale Score

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.248(a)	.062	.062	10.53203	.062	926.864	1	14084	.000
2	.439(b)	.193	.193	9.76967	.131	2284.798	1	14083	.000

The translation accommodation (E6) was used by only ten students, eight of which were classified as English-language learners. As detailed in Table 8, these eight students scored significantly below all other 4th graders. In all cases, the students using this accommodation were deemed as “non-proficient” under the NCLB provision. This is proportionally unequal to the population because the number of non-proficient students, especially at the “Does Not Meet” level (see Table 9), is much higher for the eight students receiving translations. These data suggest the accommodation did not give these students an unwanted advantage by receiving translations.

Table 8. Translation Accommodation (E6) Descriptives

Translation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No	539.5252	14078	10.84898
Yes	510.0000	8	13.22336
Total	539.5084	14086	10.87268

Table 9. Translation Accommodation (E6) Comparative Distributions

		Reading Performance Level					Total
		Exceeds	Meets	Partially Meets	Does Not Meet	Missing	
Translation	No	80	7267	5717	1014	245	14323
	Yes	0	0	2	6	2	10
Total		80	7267	5717	1020	247	14333